

REMARKS

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner has the following rejections under 35 USC §102:

- A. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 14 and 29-33 are rejected as being anticipated by Iwanaga et al.
- B. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 13, 15, 29-31 and 33 are rejected as being anticipated by Yamanaka et al.
- C. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 29-31 and 33 are rejected as being anticipated by Kemmochi et al.

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses these rejections, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant has amended Independent Claims 1, 7, 13, 29, and 31 to recite that the light emitting element comprises a pixel electrode, a light emitting layer, and an opposed electrode.¹ This feature is shown, for example, in Fig. 1 of the present application. See also *e.g.* page 2 *et seq.* of the specification.

The mechanism of light emission of the light emitting element of the claimed invention has an advantageous effect. In particular, when voltage is applied between the pixel electrode and the opposed electrode, holes and electrons are injected to the light emitting layer and recombined inside of the light emitting layer, and then light is emitted. Most of the emitted light is optically recognized. However, with devices from the relative art, some light is reflected diffusely and propagated to an edge of the substrate and cannot be taken out, and therefore cannot be optically recognized.

¹ Minor amendments were also made to the claims to correct informalities therein.

In contrast, because the pixel electrode, the light emitting layer, and the opposed electrode in the claimed invention have a curved surface, the light reflected diffusely can be taken out from a lower side of the substrate. As a result, the amount of the light which can be optically recognized is increased, compared with that of the related art. Hence, brightness of the display is increased. See *e.g.* (page 4, ln. 17 - page 5, ln. 2 of the present application.).

None of the cited references disclose or suggest this claimed feature or the advantageous effect thereof. Therefore, the claims are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicant is adding new dependent Claims 34-38 in order to further claim the feature that the light emitting layer comprises an organic material. These dependent claims are at least allowable for the same reasons as the independent claims.

If any fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Conclusion


Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 15, 2004



Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 000026568